3. In complex cases, it is important to place before the Commission all the relevant information and alternative suggested actions which might be necessary. It is then the responsibility of the Commission alone to judge whichever of the suggested actions are most appropriate in the circumstances.

REFERENCES

WILLIAMS, R. B., 1979. *Edwardsia* Costa, 1834 (Arthropoda: Crustacea): proposed suppression under the plenary powers with conservation of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841 and Edwardsiidae Andres, 1881 (Coelenterata: Actiniaria). Z.N.(S.)2261. *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36: 175–179.

COMMENT ON PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF NEOTYPE FOR *MUSCICAPA RUFICAUDA* SWAINSON, 1838 (AVES). Z.N.(S.)2270

(see vol. 36, pp. 180–186)

(1) By H.E. Wolters (*Zoological Museum Alexander Koenig, D.5300 Bonn, B.R.D.*)

Though I dislike the growing tendency to retain names for taxa to which they were erroneously applied by most or all subsequent authors, I should agree with Mr Benson's proposal to use in future the name *Siphia ruficauda* Sharpe, 1879 for the flycatcher hitherto known as *Muscicapa* (or more correctly, as I believe, *Ficedula) ruficauda* Swainson, 1838 (the holotype of which is a specimen of what is generally known as *Cyornis unicolor* Blyth, 1843) were it not for the fact that, many years before Sharpe, Blyth, 1851, *J. Asiatic Soc. Bengal,* vol. 20, p. 523, had already proposed the name *Cyornis aequalicauda* (erroneously quoted as *Muscicapa aequalicauda* by Stuart Baker, *Fauna British India,* Birds, vol. 7, p. 138) for a bird from Kunawár, Kachhar, which represents this same species. Although I have not had an opportunity to examine the type specimen, there can be no doubt from the original description (which was kindly copied for me by Dr G.F. Mees of Leiden) that Blyth's name applies to the *Muscicapa ruficauda* of authors. I therefore cannot see any reason for suppressing Blyth's name *aequalicauda,* and *Muscicapa ruficauda* auctt. therefore should stand as *Muscicapa* (or *Ficedula*) *aequalicauda* (Blyth, 1851). On the other hand, in order to avoid confusion, the binomen *Muscicapa ruficauda* Swainson, 1838, may be suppressed in favour of *Cyornis unicolor* Blyth, 1843, as proposed by Mr Benson.

(2) Reply by C.W. Benson

I agree with Dr Wolters that Blyth's name *aequalicauda* would appear to apply to the taxon *ruficauda* in the sense of Sharpe, 1879 rather than of Swainson, 1838, in view of 'whitish' under tail-coverts and 'Bill dark above, whitish below' (reference *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 36, pp. 181-182, 1979, paragraph 6). I am unaware, however, that Blyth's name has ever been used subsequently to 1851 beyond the single citation by E.C.S. Baker referred to

by Dr Wolters (the year being 1930). At least, if there are any further instances they are not mentioned by Dr. Wolters. Accordingly, to use the name *aequalicauda* in preference to the widely accepted *ruficauda* would disturb stability and cause confusion.

It seems that Dr Wolters has not understood that, if my application is approved, '*ruficauda* auctorum *sensu* Sharpe, 1879', will become *ruficauda* Swainson, 1838, and hence senior to *aequalicauda* Blyth, 1851. This unused name would thereby become a junior, not a senior synonym, and thus no threat to stability.

SOME COMMENTS ON THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON TYPIFICATION OF SPECIES OF PROTOZOA. (Z.N.(G.) 185)

By R.B. Williams (*Wellcome Research Laboratories, Berkhamsted, Herts*)

Melville, 1979, presented the report of the committee established by the International Commission on Protozoology to study the problem of typification of protozoal species and enumerated six topics which were discussed. I should like to make some comments which I hope will be useful to scientists considering the implications of that report. Although my examples are drawn largely from the homoxenous coccidia (Apicomplexa: Eimeriidae) they serve to illustrate a wide range of problems in the typification of parasitic protozoans. (Italics used in quotations indicate my own emphases.) The committee's new concept of a hapantotype was further elucidated by Garnham, Bray and Killick-Kendrick, 1979.

2.1. My first comment concerns the committee's definition of a hapantotype (paragraph 5.5), 'individuals taken at one stage in the life cycle and cycled under controlled conditions through the various host species until it is possible to draw off and preserve samples of each stage from a single *strain* which, itself, can continue to exist'. I think that the problem of simultaneously producing a hapantotype consisting of directly related individuals *and* a monospecific strain has not been sufficiently stressed. Joyner, Canning, Long, Rollinson and Williams, 1978, proposed a terminology for populations of coccidia of the genus *Eimeria* at the infrasubspecific level and recommended that '*strains* normally will be established from a *single* oocyst or sporocyst'. It has also been recommended that individual organisms be used to initiate strains of salivarian trypanosomes (Anon., 1978). In other groups of protozoans, a pair of individuals might be needed to initiate a strain, depending on the type of life cycle. It is not necessary to use expensive micromanipulators to isolate individuals. With many protozoans, the medium containing them may simply be diluted progressively until one drop contains one organism.

2.2 It cannot be stressed too strongly that this general principle should be adhered to whenever practicable since, if more than one individual or pair of individuals (whichever appropriate) were used to initiate a strain, a hapantotype derived from it might accidentally consist of more than one species. For example, there has been a great deal of controversy over the question of whether *Eimeria acervulina* Tyzzer, 1929 and *E. mivati* Edgar and Seibold, 1964 constitute the same biological species (Long, 1973; Shirley,